UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/981,645	10/16/2001	Peter Melchior	027392-000430US	7543
	7590 03/06/200 AND TOWNSEND AN	EXAMINER		
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER EIGHTH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834			DASS, HARISH T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3692	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/06/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
09/981,645	MELCHIOR ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
HARISH T. DASS	3692		

	HARISH I. DASS	3092	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>24 February 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavi al (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	which places the r (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE ).	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FI	on. LED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extra under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the size forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount on tened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee be action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on . A brief in compl	iance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be t	filed within two months	s of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exten Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS			e appeal. Since a
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		cause
(a) They raise new issues that would require further con	•	ΓE below);	
<ul> <li>(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below</li> <li>(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better</li> </ul>	•	ducina or simplifyina tl	he issues for
appeal; and/or	or rorm for appear by materially rec		110 100 100 101
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c	orresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	4. One official ad Nation of Name On		DTOL OOA)
<ol> <li>The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12</li> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> </ol>		mpliant Amendment (	PTOL-324).
<ul><li>6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be alle</li></ul>		imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
non-allowable claim(s).			
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [ how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:  AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to over showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	ıl and/or appellant fail	s to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER  11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
see paper number 20081222.			
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
13. ☑ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .			
	/Harish T Dass/		
	Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 3692	
	-		

Continuation of 13. Other: Applicant's arguments regarding dependent claims 4-6, 9 and 17 have been considered but the arguments are about limitations which are not claimed (see the claims). The argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988)and In re Jones, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, see paper # 20081222 pages 3-4, rejection of cliam 3 and 36.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "determining ... whether trade ..." page 12 for claim 4; "guarantees payment" (claim 5-6, etc) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).